Exhibit M

```
1
     c5v2quzc
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     ____X
    SANDRA GUZMAN, et al.,
                   Plaintiffs,
                                         New York, N.Y.
 5
                                          09 Civ. 9323(BSJ)(RLE)
               v.
                                          09 Civ. 9832(BSJ)(RLE)
 6
    NEWS CORPORATION, et al.,
                   Defendants.
 8
     -----X
 8
                                          May 31, 2012
 9
9
                                          2:40 p.m.
10
     Before:
10
11
11
                        HON. RONALD L. ELLIS,
12
12
                                          Magistrate Judge
13
14
14
                             APPEARANCES
15
15
     THOMPSON WIGDOR, LLP
16
         Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16
    BY: PAUL A. CLARK
17
17
          SHAFFIN A. DATOO
18
18 KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN, LLP
19
          Attorneys for Defendants
19
     BY: MARK W. LERNER
20
         BLYTHE E. LOVINGER
20
          GARRETT D. KENNEDY
21
22
    ALSO PRESENT:
    J. JORDAN LIPPNER, News America, Incorporated
23
24
25
```

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

c5v2guzc

1 2

THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of Sandra Guzman et al. v. News Corporation, et al.

All counsel please identify yourselves for the record, starting with the plaintiffs.

MR. CLARK: Paul Clark and Shaffin Datoo for the plaintiff Sandra Guzman, from the law firm of Thompson Wigdor, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. LERNER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Mark Lerner and Blythe Lovinger, of Kasowitz Benson, for the defendants. Also present is Jordan Lippner, in-house counsel for the defendants, and Garrett Kennedy, an associate at our firm. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

There are a number of issues that are pending before the court, some of which I have ruled on but have not issued opinions.

Let me begin with the issues that were decided and I have not issued opinions. The short answer to those is that you will be getting written decisions shortly, I expect within the next two weeks. I try not to promise more than I can keep, but sometimes other things come up. That includes the plaintiffs' application regarding documents and complaints filed concerning pornography complaints in the work force. It also includes plaintiff requests to depose Murdoch, and SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

c5v2guzc

plaintiffs' request to do an examination of the workplace of the New York Post premises. Those were orally ruled upon, but I have been requested and do intend to issue a written opinion.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: With respect to the matters referring to the issues that the parties have submitted, I would like to know what progress you are making on depositions.

MR. CLARK: Your Honor, we hope and anticipate that all the depositions will be finished by the end of June. It has been slowed down quite a bit. I think we have only taken a couple of depositions in the last month. The reason for that was because Kenneth Thompson, the partner on the case, has had some personal issues that has made it difficult for him to be involved. So we have not moved at quickly as we would like to. But we are in the process of finishing those up, and we do anticipate it will be done by the deadline, the last deadline the court has set, and we don't anticipate we will have to ask for any further continuances.

THE COURT: My notes indicate that you indicated that you would be finished by the 15th of June. That may not have been the deadline for discovery, but that's the date that my notes indicate. By the end of June I could live with.

MR. CLARK: Very good, your Honor.

THE COURT: I also signed a summary judgment briefing schedule, although you understand that's before Judge Jones.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

c5v2quzc

MR. LERNER: Yes, your Honor.

MR. CLARK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are prepared to talk about Guzman and

Fenner?

MR. CLARK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: With respect to Guzman, there is a motion,

THE COURT: With respect to Guzman, there is a motion defendants' motion for a protective order with respect to Col Allan?

MR. LERNER: Yes, your Honor. There were a number of questions that Mr. Allan was asked at his deposition that related to the process by which the cartoon was decided to be published. It is a very limited number of questions. I believe the total number of questions were 11, and there may -- that 11 may have included a question about another publication of a photograph and another regarding publication -- regarding a columnist. The defendants' position is that Mr. Allan answered numerous questions regarding the cartoon, regarding what it meant to him. Other witnesses have as well. And, your Honor, I don't mean to overstep --

THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Is there anything other than what's in the party's papers that they want to add? I will be issuing a written ruling on that also hopefully within the next couple of weeks.

MR. LERNER: No, your Honor, there isn't. And this is an issue which was fully briefed. We started with the exchange SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

c5v2guzc

1

6

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

of letters, and then we actually moved on to full briefs. your Honor actually has quite a bit of material before you. MR. CLARK: The only thing I would add, your Honor, I agree, I think it's been fully brief. I don't have any legal argument to add. But one thing that might not be entirely clear, Mr. Lerner speaks about the specific questions, but I just wanted to make sure the record was clear that the way they shut us down, when we were unable to ask certain questions, there may have been -- in fact, there would have been more than just those 11 questions, because obviously we weren't going to keep asking questions that they had made clear they weren't

going to answer. So there are additional things we want to ask along the lines of where they are claiming a privilege. So it's not just those 11 or so questions. I just want that to be clear.

15

THE COURT: I will say that I believe that probably would be the case, that it would not be limited to the 11 questions that were specifically asked. Given the history of this case, I think it would be a fair assumption that there would be more questions at issue, so I will take that into account in the ruling.

The next issue is the Rule 35 IME of the plaintiff; and, with respect to that, I have gotten the parties' submissions, and I believe we talked about it the last time. It appears to me that, no matter how you slice it, the SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.